REMARKS

In the last Office Action, Fig. 1 was objected to as failing to show element 101 described at page 10 of the specification.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,417 to Bartholomew ("Bartholomew"). The Examiner stated that Bartholomew discloses an information processor comprising a transceiver 11 for transmitting a signal receivable only in the range of a predetermined distance to another information processor, receiving a reply signal sent from the other processor in response to the signal transmitted by the transmitter 39, a decision unit for determining whether the reply signal has been received by the receiver, and a processing operation controller for executing a predetermined processing operation dependent upon the result of determination by the decision circuit.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,367 to Kita ("Kita"). Kita was cited as disclosing that the other information processor is a wearable on a user's wrist.

By the present response, the specification has been suitably revised to correct informalities and improve the

wording. A replacement sheet for Fig. 1 has been submitted herewith on which a block diagram of the second information processor 101 is shown. The block diagram added to Fig. 1 is not new matter since it is identical to that shown in original Fig. 2. Claims 1-12 have been canceled without prejudice or admission and replaced by new claims 13-39. The newly added claims contain revised versions of the original claims rewritten in formal respects to improve the wording and place them in better conformance with U.S. practice.

For instance, independent claim 13 is a revised version of original independent claim 1 that further recites an operation command circuit for issuing commands to perform predetermined processing operations in response to manual input. Independent claims 25 and 35 are revised versions of original independent claims 3 and 10 but further recite a receiver or receiving step for receiving an incoming call and an alert circuit or step for informing a user of the incoming call.

Applicants and applicants' undersigned attorney acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 2 and 9. In view of this, applicants have drafted new independent claims 18 and 30, which are revised versions of allowable dependent claims 2 and 9 rewritten in independent form to incorporate the subject

matter of base claims 1 and 8, respectively. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 18 and 30 are allowable over the prior art for the same reasons as original dependent claims 2 and 9. Newly added dependent claims 19-24 and 31-34 are believed allowable for the same reasons.

For the reasons stated hereinbelow, applicants respectfully submit that newly added claims 13-17, 25-29 and 35-39 are also allowable over the prior art of record.

The present invention relates to an information processing device 100 such as a portable telephone or handheld computer which engage in handshaking with another information processing device 101, such as a wrist wearable device, to provide a safety feature in the event the first information processing device is loss or mislaid.

For instance, the information processing device 100 recited by newly added independent claim 13 has an operation command circuit 301 such as a keypad or switching section for issuing commands to perform predetermined processing operations in response to manual input, a transmitter 302 for transmitting a signal receivable only in a predetermined distance range to the other information processing device 101, a receiver 303 for receiving a reply signal sent by the other information processing device 101 in response to the signal

transmitted by the transmitter 302, a decision circuit 304 for determining whether the reply signal has been received by the receiver 303, and a processing operation controller 305 for enabling execution of the predetermined processing operations depending upon the result of the determination made by the decision circuit 304.

In accordance with the present invention, a signal receivable only within a predetermined distance range is transmitted by the information processing device 100 to another information processing device 101. When the other information processing device 101 receives the signal, it sends a reply signal to a receiver 303 in the information processing device 100. A decision circuit 304 contained in the information processing device 100 determines whether the reply signal has been received by the receiver 303, and a processing operation controller 305 enables execution of the predetermined processing operations depending upon the result of the determination.

The present invention recited by newly added independent claim 13 provides the information processing device with added security by enabling it to determine whether the other information processing device, which is preferably worn by the owner, is within a predetermined distance therefrom. In such event, the processing operation

controller 305 enables execution of predetermined processing operations by the information processing device 100 in response to manual input. In the event the other information processing device is not within the predetermined range, the predetermined processing operations are not enabled.

Accordingly, if the owner of the information processing device has lost or misplaced the device, the device may be rendered nonfunctional. Thus, if the information processing device is a portable telephone, unauthorized charges are avoided. If the device is a portable computer, unauthorized data access is prevented.

In accordance with another aspect of the present invention recited by newly added independent device claim 25 and independent method claim 35, an information processing device or method is provided in which an incoming call signal received from an external device causes a signal receivable only within a predetermined distance range to be transmitted to another information processing device. If a reply signal sent from the other information processing device in response to the signal transmitted by the transmitter is received, a user of the device is alerted of the incoming call.

Thus, for instance, when the user of the device is located beyond the predetermined distance and cannot hear an alarm or ring, the device does not inform the user of the incoming call.

No corresponding structure is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Bartholomew does not disclose or suggest a device which enables processing operations to be performed in response to manual input only when first and second information processing devices are within a certain range from each other, as required by independent claim 13, and does not disclose or suggest a device or method which informs a user of an incoming call only when the user is located within a predetermined distance from the device.

Bartholomew discloses a call forwarding system utilizing smart card technology. A telephone device is associated with a smart card reader/writer and a communications unit RF transceiver. Subscribers are each provided with a smart card and an RF jacket transceiver. In response to an input received from the smart card reader/writer, the telephone system enables incoming calls to be forwarded for a given subscriber to the associated telephone device. The communications unit RF transceiver periodically transmits an interrogation signal to the RF jacket transceiver. If the interrogation signal is received by the RF jacket transceiver, the RF jacket transceiver sends an acknowledgment signal to the communications unit RF transceiver, and incoming calls will continue to be forwarded

to the associated telephone device. However, if the interrogation signal is not received by the RF jacket transceiver, the RF jacket transceiver does not transmit an acknowledgment signal, the communications unit RF transceiver does not receive the acknowledgment signal, and the communications unit RF transceiver causes the associated telephonic device to instruct the communications system to no longer forward incoming calls to the associated telephone device.

Contrastingly, the invention recited by newly added independent claim 13 includes an operation command circuit for issuing commands to perform predetermined processing operations in response to manual input, and a processing operation controller for enabling execution of the predetermined processing operations depending upon a distance between the information processing device and another information processing device. Bartholomew does not relate to a device that enables processing operations to be performed in response to manual input depending upon the location of another information processing device, as recited by independent claim 13.

Nor does Bartholomew disclose or suggest a device or method which informs a user of an incoming call only when the user is located within a predetermined distance from the device as recited by independent claims 25 and 35.

Accordingly, Bartholomew does not anticipate any of newly added claims 13-17, 25-29 and 35-39.

Nor does Bartholomew render the newly added claims obvious. To render an invention obvious, the prior art must establish the obviousness of each limitation of a rejected claim. When any form of modification of the prior art is needed to replicate the claimed invention, the desirability of such modification must be suggested by the prior art. In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Here, no prima facie case of obviousness of claims 13-17, 25-29 or 35-39 can be supported based on Bartholomew taken alone, or in combination with Kita. Although Kita discloses a wrist wearable information processing device, there is nothing in the combined teachings of the cited references that would expressly or impliedly teach or suggest a device which enables processing operations to be performed in response to manual input only when first and second information processing devices are within a certain range from each other, as required by independent claim 13, or a device or method which informs a user of an incoming call only when the user is located within a predetermined distance from the device.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 13-39 patentably distinguish over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and discussion, the application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS
Attorneys for Applicants

By: _____
Bruce L. Adams
Reg. No. 25,386

50 Broadway
31st Floor
New York, NY 10004
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS FEE AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Paul Hoffman
Name

_____
Signature

April 5, 2004
Date